

2-18-1975

## Campus Assembly minutes 02/18/1975

Campus Assembly

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp\\_assembly](https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp_assembly)

---

### Recommended Citation

Campus Assembly, "Campus Assembly minutes 02/18/1975" (1975). *Campus Assembly*. 193.  
[https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp\\_assembly/193](https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp_assembly/193)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Campus Assembly by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact [skulann@morris.umn.edu](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

Minutes of the Fourth Meeting of the 1974-75  
Campus Assembly

Science Auditorium, February 18, 1975; 4-6 p.m.

Provost Imholte introduced Sister Marie Savickas who will join the Elementary Education faculty on March 1.

Imholte, speaking for Clyde Johnson, Chairman of the UMM committee for the bicentennial observance, invited proposals and suggestions for UMM's participation in that event.

Merle Hirsh was acting parliamentarian for the meeting.

Gerald Gettel has replaced Mark Palmquist as student member of the Assembly.

Imholte reported that UMM's Academic Grievance Committee is studying the campus grievance review process in order to make it consistent with Senate legislation passed last April. The Consultative Committee and Women's Commission are reviewing their roles. Assembly members can expect policy statements soon.

An article appeared recently in the Morris newspaper, describing a possible comparative study of UMM and Southwest State. Imholte thought the article was accurate. He thought such a study would not imply a threat to UMM's existence. UMM is not now scheduled for any formal appearance before legislative groups for such comparison, although a staff member from a House Appropriations subcommittee has requested physical plant data, which will be supplied.

Bopp reminded Assembly members of the proposal for evaluation of teaching effectiveness sent from his office on February 13. Although no evaluation is mandatory this quarter, he urged the use of some evaluative instrument, either the questionnaire available from his office or one from Measurement Services.

Abbott reported that the Senate Consultative Committee will visit UMM on Thursday, February 20; an open meeting will be held from 1:30 - 3 p.m.

The minutes of the November 18 Assembly meeting were approved.

Graduation honors for three graduating students were approved.

There was no discussion of the information item on committee rosters.

Debate turned to the package of curricular proposals. French wondered if the Assembly was approving bulletin copy. Imholte replied that the Assembly was approving the substance of what would go into the bulletin, but that editorial changes would still be possible.

All curricular proposals were approved, although it was necessary for the Assembly to extend the time during which motions could be introduced (the time was extended from 5:30 to 6 p.m.)

The following were approved with no questions or comments from the floor: Elementary Education; Physical Education; History; Political Science; Sociology; Art History; Studio Art; English; French; German; Spanish; Music; Speech.

The following were approved with minor editorial corrections or brief explanation: Psychology: under the summary, item 3a, Psych 1200 should have been listed. Philosophy: the course description of Phil 3104 was incomplete and Phil 3140 was not to be co-listed with Math. Math and Computer Science: Survey of Calculus could be used for a math minor. European Fine Arts Seminar: the Curriculum Committee vote (9 in favor, 0 against) had been omitted.

Hirsh reported that the teaching majors in biology, chemistry, geology, and physics had been removed from the proposals because the initial attempt at meeting the new State Department Regulations had produced programs of too many credits. The teaching majors are being reconsidered by the appropriate disciplines. Imholte read a statement authored by Hirsh which gives a general statement of the new certification requirements; this statement is to be included in the bulletin. Hirsh reported that the course description for Geol 3600f, Stratigraphy and Sedimentation, had been inadvertently omitted from the geology proposal. The statement of certification requirements and the curricular proposals in the four sciences were passed without additional comment as amended and corrected.

Farrell wondered if (1) the proposed Business Economics minor constituted a new program that required justification from, for example, HECC: (2) it were different from the Business major that had been eliminated a few years ago. He stated that some schools have eliminated business programs as inconsistent with a liberal arts program. Bopp replied to the first question. It is not a new program because of the existing program in Economics. Driggs replied to the second question. There had been an Economics Business program but the business aspect was de-emphasized and some borderline courses relisted as Economics. The proposed Business Economics minor consists of taking these courses back out of Economics and into Business Economics - a more accurate listing - and adding three new courses. The Business Economics and Economics proposal was approved.

The proposed Social Science Competency Based Major provoked considerable discussion.

Driggs asked Assembly members to note that the memo reading "The following document is for information not for action, etc." was misplaced. The informational document was the one entitled "Competency Based Social Science Major at UMM."

Questions were raised about the size of the major, cited at 75-79 credits. Didn't that violate the UMM 60 credit-limit rule? Bopp replied that the rule applied only to courses in a single discipline, whereas the major cut across discipline lines.

Purdy questioned the Objectives in the informational memo. How did one determine if they were being met? For example, on p.6 - how did one determine that a "student's inner resources" had been cultivated? What were the inner resources? His soul? Driggs replied that, for example, an inner resource might be the self-confidence to address a new problem. Winter emphasized that these resources were to be cultivated, not measured.

French wondered why the material on p.23 of the information memo - "Means for Evaluating Competencies" - wasn't part of the proposal. Wouldn't students be better able to decide to enter the program if that information were in the bulletin? Driggs thought one normally didn't describe pedagogical techniques in bulletins, though he had no strong opinion on the subject. Guyotte felt that it might be misleading to try to spell them out. The advising system is crucial to the program and competency evaluation is better presented at the adviser-advisee level. Lee said that the criteria were still being worked out; what one had here was a general framework with details yet to be filled in or revised. French and Farrell wondered if the plan, then, was ready to be implemented. Driggs assured Assembly members that a completed, though complicated, proposal, ready for implementation, was being advanced. Attempts to explain the pedagogy in the bulletin would probably be unwise, since their brevity might imply a simplicity that did not obtain.

Farrell asked if all the History courses required to demonstrate the minimum competencies in History (p.11) were introductory. Driggs replied in the affirmative, but the point was that the History discipline guaranteed that a student would have to demonstrate the competencies there in order to get credit; it did not follow that competencies would not be tested elsewhere.

The discussion concluded with remarks from a number of individuals about the pedagogical issue. A vote for the program was, in fact, a vote for its pedagogy (Purdy). Is there a distinction in any field between the pedagogy and the major? (French). Surely the structure of the discussion implied such a distinction; the real issue, however, was method of evaluation, not pedagogy (Klinger).

The proposal for the Social Science Competency Based Major was approved.

Mitchell moved that the approval of the student membership of the MCUB be tabled. This non-debatable motion failed with 27 in favor, 16 against, 17 abstentions.

Cole explained that the MCSA Forum had voted in favor of tabling this slate because of questions about the constitutional status of the MCUB and the selection process for on-campus members. Jauert explained that the latter referred to inconsistent selection methods. Mitchell pointed out that the Executive Committee had appointed a subcommittee in response to a student petition to study these questions and thought the slate should not be approved until the study was completed. Fier explained that the use of the phrase "financial irregularities" referred to whether Assembly committees should have budgets and/or spend student money.

The question was raised as to whether the Executive Committee knew of these charges when it put the slate on the agenda. Guyotte stated that the Executive Committee had felt that the petitioners were asking about MCUB's constitutional status. Raymond felt that the petition had not called for lack of a Union Board.

Krass, Chairman of the MCUB, wondered in what sense the selection process could be termed irregular, since there are no prescribed procedures. The MCUB had gone to the dorms and asked that some selection process be carried out; the results were rather haphazard. He questioned whether the Union Board really spent money, since only Richard Johnson, who has a civil service appointment, could sign the checks. The Union Board makes policy "down to the bare essentials."

Haage asserted that the Union Board does spend money, that it has a constitution of its own from the time preceding its Assembly status, and that its on-campus members had not been approved by the Student Affairs Committee.

Hinmon thought that the Assembly was being asked, inappropriately, to do the work of the subcommittee. The slate should be approved.

French moved that the slate be returned to the Executive Committee, who should determine if the subcommittee should look at the charge of irregularities in this specific election. He is a member of the subcommittee and thought the charge was more general.

Klinger and Bopp thought there were two separate issues: approval of the slate, which should occur, and the work of the subcommittee on the underlying principles.

Klinger indicated he would prefer to have the slate approved as official until a report came back from the Executive Committee.

French withdrew his motion.

Haage moved adjournment. This failed, 13-25.

Haage called for a quorum count. There was no longer a quorum and the meeting ended.

Submitted by Jim Togeas

pt